

MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28TH, 2004

Commissioners Present: Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Annette Rose, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council
Al Boro, San Rafael City Council
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council

Commissioners absent: Jerry Butler, Belvedere City Council
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council
Tom Byrnes, Ross Town Council
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, TAM Executive Director
Dean Powell, Principal Transportation Planner, Marin County DPW
Tho Do, Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW
Art Brook, Senior Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW
Carey Lando, Senior Transportation Planner, Marin County DPW
Jack Baker, Senior Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW
JeriLynne Stewart, Recording Secretary

Chair Steve Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin Meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

- 1) Commissioner Matters Not On The Agenda

None.

- 2) Approval of TAM Minutes of July 22nd, 2004

Commissioner Eklund motioned to approve the minutes; Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Commissioners Lundstrom, Breen and Gill abstained. Motion passed 9/4/3.

- 3) Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Craig Tackabery said that MTC have a hearing/workshop on the Regional Transportation Plan release Thursday December 2nd at the Marin Center Exhibit Hall at 6:30 p.m. The November and December TAM meetings will be held the third Thursday of the month, and not the fourth Thursday due to the holidays.

He also said that a year and a half ago, all of the cities and towns met to conduct an inventory of Marin's road system for MTC, to assist with deriving the shortfall numbers. TAM will coordinate a

similar effort again this year; document packages were mailed to all city and town public works directors. Inventories are due from the cities and town at the end of December.

- 4) Commissioner Reports
 - a. Executive Committee

Mr. Tackabery summarized details of the October 6, 2004 Executive Committee meeting. There was an update of the local fixed route contract between Marin County Transit District (MCTD) and Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (GGBH&TD). Terms of the contract will be brought to the MCTD in November; one big item is the (passage of) Measure A, and how much money there will be available to MCTD. Basic terms, such as which routes belong to whom, how much service would cost per hour, have been determined.

A brief discussion was held regarding the Regional Ride Share Program run by MTC, and how TAM could become more involved in said program.

Finally, there was discussion about the community-based transportation-planning grant. MTC has offered a grant to a Marin County community – either the Canal area or Marin City – for the next fiscal year. It is a program focusing on all economically disadvantaged communities of the Bay Area. The Executive Committee recommended that the Canal area would be first, and Marin City would be second.

- b. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Group (PAG) – Commissioner Murray

The Policy Advisory Group (PAG) did not meet this past month.

- i. Request from Commissioner Murray to Appoint Two Design Professionals to the Aesthetic Selection Subcommittee

Commissioner Murray, via request from Caltrans, nominated two design professionals who are landscape architects, Steve Arago and Ralph Alexander. Commissioner Tremaine seconded the nomination. The nominations were accepted 12/0/0.

- c. SMART

SMART met this past month. There was nothing new to report at this time.

Commissioner Adams asked about the status of the environmental impact studies, scoping, etc. Commissioner Rose said that environmental impact studies (EIR/EIS) will be publicly available in 2005. Some draft versions have gone to the Federal Railroad Authority (FRA), yet they are not allowed to be publicly released until the FRA reviews. There are intended to be a number of public meetings for EIR/EIS commentary, once the FRA approves the release of the documents. Commissioner Rose explained that what elements will be included in their EIR/EIS was decided upon two years ago. The Scope of Work is currently available, and includes a 'no-train alternative' utilizing buses only. Commissioner Adams said that she and Commissioner Boro are coordinating efforts to ensure the bicycle/pedestrian pathway through San Rafael is part of the EIR/EIS review process. Executive Director Tackabery said that TAM's perspective on the issue is that it is the local sponsor of the Gap Closure Project. The project's ready to go to bid without a bicycle/pedestrian pathway, or an west (of the railroad tracks) soundwall. He said staff is working with SMART and Caltrans to determine the feasibility of moving the soundwall to the west side of the railroad tracks, and a bicycle path. Both elements are included as eligible in Measure A. If Measure A does not pass, a different discussion will ensue regarding funding of the Gap Closure Project. The opportunity exists that an addendum or supplement to Caltrans' approved EIR/EIS could be added, which could happen fairly

soon, and would be under TAM's purview, which could achieve the same goal as inclusion in the SMART EIR/EIS.

5) Caltrans Report on project Delivery Process and Project Study Reports Status

Jit Pandher, Caltrans' Regional Project Manager, presented a general overview on how Caltrans builds projects as outlined in a 1998 booklet. The booklet included general information on feasibility studies, identification of needs, system and regional transportation planning, types of projects, project teams and reports, environmental studies, obtaining approvals, agreements and permits, completion of project design, preparation and advertisement of contracts, completion of construction project, and finally, the project close-out phase.

Mr. Pandher discussed the differences between Caltrans' and MTC's planning processes. He presented detailed information on the Project Study Report (PSR) status of four projects in Marin County, including the Greenbrae Interchange, the East Blithedale Avenue/Tiburon Boulevard Interchange, the Interstate 580/Route 101 junction and the Lucas Valley/101 Interchange.

Commissioner Boro said that regarding the I-580/Route 101 project, the City of San Rafael is on record strongly opposing a 5-story over-crossing, cutting through Central San Rafael. Commissioner Boro recommends further discussion of the impact of this project prior to Caltrans moving forward. Further concerns include I-580 northbound. Commissioner Boro's understanding is that the northbound project is 10-years out. Executive Director Tackabery said the PSR for this project is simply the initial document of what the scope of a possible project could be; it doesn't initiate a project, yet it assists Caltrans in determining resources. Commissioner Boro questioned why alternatives have not been offered, especially considering the controversial nature of this particular project. Mr. Tackabery said Caltrans should be looking at a range of alternatives to determine the potential scope and community impact of any project. Mr. Pandher said the I-580/Route 101 PSR does identify the nature of Commissioner Boro's concerns, and said Caltrans is reviewing all alternatives possible. Mr. Pandher said an administrative draft of the PSR will be available to staff in the next few weeks.

Commissioner Adams expressed concerns about the public process and how environmental impacts are assessed. She requested clarification of the process for the County to be actively involved. Mr. Pandher said that there were no public meetings, per se, regarding the PSR's, and that the PSR does not address environmental concerns, it merely identifies potential environmental concerns. Addressing concerns is the next step, whereby Caltrans studies in detail the environmental document. Mr. Pandher's understanding of the public process is that when and if the transportation agencies agree on a particular project, then the environmental process starts, featuring local public hearings, scoping meetings, etc.

Commissioner Rose asked about the on-going interchange improvements at 101/East Blithedale Avenue/Tiburon Avenue. Mr. Pandher said that the PSR identifies 5 phases of improvements, and was approved by Caltrans in September 2004. Commissioner Rose pointed out that she and staff have been meeting with Caltrans about the soundwall and other portions of the project for several years. She said that Caltrans has canceled the last several meetings where Caltrans and staff were to discuss objections to portions of the project. Caltrans received a letter from the Board of Supervisors detailing which portions of the first phase project they objected to. Commissioner Rose recommended she, staff, and Caltrans meet right away to discuss this issue. Executive Director Tackabery responded a tentative meeting has been scheduled for November 8th.

Public comment:

David Schoenbrunn, TRANSDEF, said it was his understanding that once a PSR is approved, it proves to be very close to how the project is actually initiated and delivered, even with an environmental review process. The fact that a PSR was approved, yet not seen by TAM, is troubling. Secondly, he said that Caltrans' Corridor Concept Reports were created in the 1950's or 1970's, and contain outmoded concepts that have been repudiated in transportation planning. He said the Concept Report forms the basis of freeway widening throughout the State, and requested a copy of the relevant corridor concepts for Marin for his review. Executive Director Tackabery said that as no funding was available, the PSR's were on Caltrans' back burner. He said the \$12M, 5-phases for 101/East Blithedale/Tiburon Boulevard were reviewed by staff a couple of years ago, yet no one's reviewed them recently. The PSR is a tool for decision-makers to determine whether a project will go forward or not. A "PR" which is a Project Report, Mr. Tackabery explained, is a report used to select what will actually be built. A PR cannot be approved until the environmental documents have been approved.

Commissioner Rose complemented Caltrans for attending TAM meetings. She said that a couple of years ago, the former Caltrans District 4 Director explained that the money for the 101/East Blithedale soundwall had been 'freed-up,' as most of their retrofit projects had been completed. A series of conversations took place between Commissioner Rose and the former Director. She said the last thought was to eliminate trees and build a soundwall. The County wrote a letter to Caltrans, describing myriad methods to mitigate sound (from Highway 101). Commissioner Rose said her understanding was that funding was available for at least the soundwall portion of the project, not the entire project. Mr. Tackabery said the phase Commissioner Rose referred to, the ramp widening and the soundwall is funded; it was a SHOPP project.

Karen Nygren asked that if the project is already in its design phase, does the design contain a soundwall. She said the City of Mill Valley opposed a soundwall, and that the Town of Tiburon was silent about the issue at the time. She also asked for clarity as to whether the over-crossing was to be widened by one or two lanes. Regarding the progress of the Greenbrae Interchange improvements, she requested that TAM and Caltrans bring the public up to date; her concerns were about the public as a whole not being involved with the PSR process. Ms. Nygren hoped the November 8th meeting would be public. Ms. Nygren asked that, prior to the PSR being completed, TAM provide a meeting with Caltrans and the community.

Caltrans' Jit Pandher said that regarding the PSR for the Greenbrae Interchange, Caltrans does not have a public meeting process. Regarding 101/East Blithedale, he said it is not Caltrans' intent to build a soundwall if the community does not want it. Caltrans' concern is that the off-ramp/safety improvement project is being expedited by local agencies along with Caltrans; if it takes a public meeting, then so be it; there will be a public meeting. Caltrans would like to see the safety portion of the project expedited and completed, to everyone's satisfaction.

Ms. Nygren summated that Caltrans' description of the two separate PSR's – the Greenbrae Interchange and the off-ramp/safety improvement – could be in conflict. The off-ramp/safety project seems to be already in the design phase; which is why the community needs to be involved now. The community wants to know how Caltrans is proceeding with the design phase via the SHOPP project/process. There are very strong community feelings about the area, let alone the process Caltrans has already put into motion.

Commissioner Boro asked that if once a PSR is completed, who are the decision-makers making decisions to take the next step. Executive Director Tackabery explained that for a project to be put into the STIP, it has to have an approved PSR. The STIP is reviewed every two years (by TAM). We have a variety of projects on which commissioners could decide to program. Caltrans has a SHOPP

program, generally for safety improvements/projects; TAM has STIP programs. TAM would be the deciding body which deems the initiation of the Highway 580 South project. Commissioner Boro then asked why doesn't TAM deal with the problem that has no planning initiated, which is northbound 580, down Francisco Boulevard? This entire PSR and design phase aspect of Caltrans' process needs to be investigated before we complete, say, the Greenbrae Interchange project now, and then maybe 10 years from now we deal with the next problem.

Commissioner Fredericks said that regarding the 101/East Blithedale/Tiburon Boulevard interchange improvements and the soundwall, Caltrans appeared in front of the Town of Tiburon about a year ago, when the Town decided the people most affected by the soundwall should be making the decision about it.

Commissioner Lundstrom said a question continues to rise about the preliminary project of the Greenbrae Interchange, and that it went without public process. The Larkspur City Manager will soon combine forces with the Corte Madera Manager to provide a history to Mr. Tackabery and TAM, and provide details of all public input meetings that were held to come to the preliminary range of the project's parameters: Tamalpais Drive to the Greenbrae Interchange, and a new interchange at Wornum Drive.

Deb Hubsmith explained that all projects dealing with freeways also deal with pedestrians and bicyclists. On freeway on-ramps and off-ramps, that join with local arterial roads (i.e. Blithedale), it is very important to consider how the movement of non-motorized travelers can go in those areas. The City of Larkspur had conducted a 3-year planning study in conjunction with Caltrans, the County, and Town of Corte Madera to devise an alternative for a Central Marin Ferry Connection project, in the same vicinity as the Greenbrae Interchange project. Ms. Hubsmith urged TAM commissioners to obtain a copy of that particular study. She asked about the status of a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) regarding the Greenbrae Interchange project.

Chair Kinsey said that just this past week, the Board of Supervisors authorized advertisement for a Project Manager for that overall project. The County of Marin has agreed to provide staffing for that project on behalf of TAM. Once a project manager is on board, a CAC will be appointed.

6) Adoption of 2005 Meeting Calendar

Commissioner Eklund moved to adopt TAM's 2005 Meeting Calendar; Commissioner Belser seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

7) Approval of Final Local Transportation for Livable Communities and Housing Incentive Program (TLC/HIP) Guidelines

Senior Transportation Planner Carey Lando said that at last month's meeting, staff presented to TAM the draft of the TLC/HIP for the local portion. Staff received several comments from TAM commissioners, and in response, the T-Plus Advisory Committee met again to review the comments and provide staff with direction.

Trent Lethco with ARUP summarized the comments and changes/recommendations to the program. The first suggestion was for ARUP to maintain priority for the Housing Incentive Program (HIP). The second piece was regarding grant size – what's too small? The range of \$150K to \$500K was endorsed by the committee and therefore maintained. What will happen however, when TAM has a call for HIP projects? Might they be excluding worthy transportation projects that could retain funding if they had a TLC capital cycle? TAM has one year of funding that can be spent at anytime during this federal cycle; Mr. Lethco suggested it be spent concurrently with the HIP program.

Some important details: 1) A one-time concurrent Call for Projects with local HIP and local TLC capital (spring, '05); 2) Annual evaluation allows for modifications or changes as needed.

Should TAM decide to adopt the program tonight, there will be a series of occurrences happening, some simultaneously: 1) Board Adoption; 2) MTC will have its regional program actively on-going which Marin can participate in, HIP in Winter, '04 and TLC capital in Spring '05; 3) there will be a Local Call for Projects, before which there will need to be an application process developed; technical workshops and outreach will be initiated to allow the local jurisdictions to partake in these grant programs; and, 4) ARUP reports back to TAM what they've seen during the application process.

Commissioner Lundstrom questioned a portion of the Transportation Infrastructure Projects within ARUP's findings. "Funding may be made available at the end of each 3-year cycle for transportation...depending on the amount awarded to the high priority housing..." She asked what if TAM has less than \$150K available. Mr. Lethco explained that since this is federal money, if TAM had \$50K remaining, TAM could roll it into the next cycle to fund a different project within the County. Mr. Lethco suggests the \$50K be pooled into some other program or project, rather than simply being spent on a stand-alone project, since federal dollars are so difficult to administer. Mr. Lethco continued by saying the money could be rolled into a TLC capital program.

Are there enough deadlines for "doable" projects? Commissioner Lundstrom was thinking about various HUD projects, which have sat for years and years, tying up funds. Mr. Lethco explained the screening criteria are intended to weed-out projects which may never get out the door. He referred to spending HIP dollars, then, TLC capital funds. The funds are granted on a "use it or lose it" basis.

Commissioner Fredericks asked about the cost of administering federal dollars; the cost to the granting agency, or the applicant, or both? Mr. Lethco explained that when a city or town receives federal funds, they have to get an "E-76" from Caltrans. All of that intricate document processing costs quite a bit.

Commissioner Boro asked how information is being disseminated to the local Planning Directors. Ms. Lando listed many members of the Advisory Committee who report to respective cities and towns as well as several community interest group representatives. She said all Planning Directors have received the draft guidelines. Chair Kinsey requested staff distribute the draft guidelines again to all Planning Directors, and request that the city and town planners know and honor the deadline (sometime in 2005) being given them.

Commissioner Eklund motioned to accept the TLC/HIP guidelines; Commissioner Fredericks seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0/.

8) Presentation of Updated Draft Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) and Pedestrian-Oriented Design (PeD) Toolkit Principles, Issues, and Barriers

Thomas Kronemeyer with CD+A, lead consultants for the T-PLUS project, explained that revisions were made to the Principles & Benefits and Issues & Barriers documents, based on recommendations from public testimony at the September 23rd TAM meeting, and from the subsequent T-PLUS Advisory Committee meeting. Mr. Kronemeyer explained how the information was organized and how it is to be utilized by each jurisdiction.

An outline for the Toolkit itself – which is a binder/bound set of documents containing a series of practices by which to be guided - is what Mr. Kronemeyer and his staff are preparing, and expect to present to TAM at the December 16th meeting. It will contain and reflect the principles and benefits shown in the documents called Issues & Barriers, which are in tonight's packets. Those Issues &

Barriers will help specifically address the transit-oriented development issues related to Marin. He said they would also address what Marin can do to get the kind of results it's expecting from this Toolkit. He and his staff will be guided by the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. By March 2005, Mr. Kronemeyer hopes to gain TAM's approval for the Toolkit in its entirety.

David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF asked if this document would be publicly distributed. Mr. Kronemeyer said this issue had not been fully discussed at this point. The work product, however, has and will continue to be distributed to the Public Works Directors, City, and Town Managers, as described above. If a workshop is requested, Mr. Kronemeyer said it could be accommodated. Mr. Schonbrunn requested the Toolkit be distributed to the public, after having been reviewed by a graphic artist. He found the format, as presented in tonight's packet, was not easy to follow. Mr. Schonbrunn then said the Issues & Barriers document would be more easily digested if it, too, were in a similar 3-column format. He said it was not acceptable to leave the "fears and bugaboos" unaddressed in the document, by creating a direct response within the table itself to address those issues.

Commissioner Tremaine moved to authorize the staff to work with the T-PLUS Advisory Committee on the development of the Toolkit fundamentals, which includes recommendations for TOD/Ped planning strategies, "best practices," and implementation steps. Commissioner Lundstrom seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

9) Selection of TAM Auditor

Chair Kinsey summarized the staff report.

Commissioner Belser moved to 1) authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract with R.J. Ricciardi, CPA, for the FY 2003/04 audit, and 2) to direct staff to prepare and RFP to select a different auditor for the FY 04/05 audit. Commissioner Fredericks seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

10) Regional Measure 2 Subcommittee Appointment

Chair Kinsey summarized the staff report.

Commissioner Lundstrom recommended not only the Supervisors, Larkspur and Corte Madera Commissioners be subcommittee members, but to include San Rafael's Commissioner Boro, as San Rafael is an integral part of all RM2 issues. Commissioner Gill suggested that the Mill Valley Commissioner could be a representative, for the same reason, being on the south end of the project area. Chair Kinsey said that all actions would come back to the full body of TAM, presenting an objective view of the entire region's interests.

Commissioner Lundstrom moved to appoint a subcommittee of TAM Commissioners to work with staff to implement the Greenbrae Interchange Corridor project. Supervisors from Districts 2 and 4, and Commissioners from Larkspur, Corte Madera, and San Rafael will form the subcommittee. Commissioner Gill seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

11) Memorandum of Understanding with County of Marin Regarding Staffing and Budget Amendments for Additional Staffing

Executive Director Tackabery explained that this is follow-up on action TAM took on July 22 where TAM approved the request for funding for RM2 from MTC, which included funding for a Project Manager. It formalizes the staffing in the budget, and adds this additional position.

Commissioner Tremaine moved to authorize the Chair to execute the Memorandum of Understanding, 2) increase the revenue recognizing the new RM 2 funding source in the amount of \$98,000, and 3) increase the expenditure amount for County staff by \$98,000. Commissioner Eklund seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/0.

12) Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF, reminded TAM and attendees that the Countywide Plan is available. On light-nights, such as this, a convening of the Countywide Planning Agency and TAM would be advisable. He suggested that each of the jurisdictions be involved in seeing the Countywide Plan represent the County as a whole. He also suggested to have a skill-building session in which Commissioners could learn about funding cycles, for instance.

Executive Director Tackabery explained that he has worked with the County Community Development Agency who will be presenting issues concerning the Countywide Plan to TAM at the December 16th meeting. He also said that last December, TAM had concerns regarding communication with Caltrans. He reported that he developed with Caltrans a series of presentations on a variety of issues and that Caltrans has been very responsive to our questions.

13) Open Time for Items Not On the Agenda

None.

Chair Kinsey adjourned the TAM meeting at 8:52 p.m.